

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CHRISALYN MARTIN-QUIGLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01464-RFB-VCF

ORDER

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 21) of the Honorable Cam Ferenbach, United States Magistrate Judge, entered February 1, 2018.

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by February 15, 2018. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations.

